24th January 1933]

boards are informed that the distinction intended by Government is between lorries plying for hire and those which do not so ply and that the lorries falling under the former category are those which must be granted a ' G ' permit under rule 30 of the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules, 1923. If cases of evasion come to the notice of presidents of district boards, they should at once report the same to the District Magistrate concerned for necessary action.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. CONRAN SMITH,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards.
,, all Chairmen of Municipal Councils.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.
,, all District Magistrates (with copies of G.O. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932).
,, the Law (General) Department.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 475 asked by Mr. M. Devadasan at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 24th January 1933, page 173 supra.]

Name and description of the scheme.	Remarks.
1 Ghiriar project	Vide answer to question No. 618.
2 *Kallar project.*—This provided for the diversion of the Kallar stream which flows to the west by the construction of a tunnel and other connected works.	The project was not investigated in detail as it was found that the amount of water to be diverted was very small and the cost would be out of proportion to the possible increase in revenue and the work was not likely to be useful by way of famine relief. A combined Irrigation and Hydro-Electric scheme was considered later and dropped as it was not possible to effect a satisfactory settlement with the Travancore Darbar, and as there were other projects under consideration.
3 Project for the utilization of the surplus water of the Nambiyar by improving the Kovankulam anicut, the excavation of a channel therefrom and the construction of a new tank to be supplied by it to irrigate 2,000 acres. Estimated cost Rs. 1,87,000 and the anticipated return was Rs. 10,000.	The project was given up as the return was small and the water-supply precarious and as there were engineering difficulties.
4 *Parapar Scheme.*—This consisted in the diversion of Parapar and two other hill streams for improving irrigation facilities in the district at a cost of about Rs. 30,000.	The scheme was considered hopeless both on engineering and financial grounds.

[24th January 1933

Name and description of the scheme.	Remarks.
5 *Papanasam Reservoir project.*—The proposal is to construct a reservoir on the Tambraparni in the Papanasam hills and to increase the supply to the anicuts across the river below.	Gaugings of the supply available were taken for a few years. Subsequently the scheme was held up pending the investigation of a combined irrigation and hydro-electric scheme. As it is not proposed to proceed with the hydro-electric scheme at present the question of working out an independent irrigation scheme is under examination by the local officers.
6 *Supply channel to the Ottapidaram Periyakulam and connected tanks.*—The scheme consists in the construction of an anicut across the Arakulam odai and the excavation of a channel therefrom to improve the supply to Ottapidaram Periyakulam and other connected rainfed tanks to augment supply to the existing ayacut of 598 acres and to extend irrigation to a small extent.	The proposal was dropped owing to the scanty supply available as ascertained from gaugings of the river taken for a series of years and as the scheme was unpromising financially. A smaller scheme for extending irrigation to 209 acres under Mandaikulam tank anicut is under consideration by local officers.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS